

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action dated January 12, 2006.

Claims 1-3, 5, 13-15 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,958).

Claims 1, 7-10 and 13-23 have been amended. Sugiyama does not teach the element of dividing a print task into a plurality of modified print tasks. Accordingly, this rejection is now overcome.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971). Claim 23 has been amended. Owa et al do not disclose “modified print tasks wherein the size of each of said modified print tasks is proportional at least one of a printer speed, printer availability and a printer media capacity for a printer associated with said modified print task.” Accordingly, claim 23 is now patentable.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,958) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Taniguchi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,972). Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1 through claim 3 and is, therefore, patentable for the reasons stated above with regard to claims 1 and 3 since the combination of Sugiyama and Taniguchi do not disclose “modified print tasks wherein the size of each of said modified print tasks is proportional at least one of a

printer speed, printer availability and a printer media capacity for a printer associated with said modified print task.”

Claims 6, 7, 10, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,958) as applied to claims 3 and 13 above, and further in view of Owa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971).

Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 7 and 10 are dependent on claim 1. Claims 16 and 19 are dependent on claim 13. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended, therefore claims 7, 10, 16 and 19 have been amended by dependence on claims 1 and 13. The combination of Sugiyama and Owa does not teach “modified print tasks wherein the size of each of said modified print tasks is proportional at least one of a printer speed, printer availability and a printer media capacity for a printer associated with said modified print task.” Sugiyama does not teach any print task division and Owa teaches only a page-content-based splitting technique. Accordingly, these claims are now patentable in their currently-amended condition.

Claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,958) and Owa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,971) as applied to claims 6 and 13 above, and further in view of Shimada (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,136). Each of these claims is dependent on claim 1 or 13. The combination of Sugiyama, Owa and Shimada does not teach “modified print tasks wherein the size of each of said modified print tasks is proportional at least one of a printer speed, printer availability and a printer media capacity for a printer associated with said modified print task.” Accordingly, these claims are allowable in their currently amended form.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,958) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Onuma (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,669). Each of these claims is dependent on claim 1. Regardless of any disclosure of a use of a printer-ready file in Onuma, these claims are patentable as the combination of Sugiyama and Onuma does not disclose “modified print tasks wherein the size of each of said modified print tasks is proportional at least one of a printer speed, printer availability and a printer media capacity for a printer associated with said modified print task.”

Accordingly, these claims are patentable, as amended, and the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner allow these claims in their current form.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/
Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589